


### REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the restriction requirement of the Office Action mailed February 10, 2006 (hereinafter "Office Action"). The Office Action identifies two inventions, a Group I (Claims 1-20 and 40-47) drawn to a power conversion apparatus and a Group II (Claims 25-39) drawn to an uninterruptible power supply. Applicant continues to provisionally elect Group II (Claims 25-39), and continues traversal of the restriction requirement, as the Office Action appears to not have made the restriction requirement final.

The Office Action continues to assert "Group I and Group II are related as combination and subcombination." Office Action, p. 2. This is incorrect, as Claim 25 is not a subcombination of Claim 1. As noted in Applicant's prior response filed December 23, 2005, "a combination is an organization of which a subcombination or element is a part." See MPEP 810.05(a). In particular, *Claim 25 contains additional elements to those recited in Claim 1, such that it is not a "part" of Claim 1.* Therefore, Claim 25 is not a subcombination of Claim 1. In fact, as noted in Applicant's prior response, Claim 1 of Group I is a *subcombination* with respect to Claim 25, and the requirements for two-way distinctness between these claims required to support restriction of such a combination/subcombination relationship is not present.

Applicant notes that there is an apparent contradiction between the "Respond to Argument" section and the "Restriction Requirement" section on page 2 of the Office Action. The "Respond to Argument" section appears to acknowledge that Claim 1 stands in relation as a subcombination of the combination recited in Claim 25. However, this appears to be at odds with the combination/subcombination relationship alleged in the "Restriction Requirement" section, which, as noted above, appears to assert that Claim 25 is a subcombination of Claim 1. Applicant also points out that the Office Action omits any requirement regarding Claims 21-24 and 48. Accordingly, if the restriction requirement is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests clarification of the restriction requirement before making such requirement final.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. Meeks  
Registration No. 40,723


In re: Esa Paätero  
Serial No.: 10/808,007  
Filed: March 24, 2004  
Page 12 of 12

Customer Number 20792  
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.  
P.O. Box 37428  
Raleigh, NC 27627  
919-854-1400  
919-854-1401 (Fax)



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on March 24, 2006.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Traci A. Brown